

Atty. Dkt. No. 200209155-1

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on March 23, 2006 in which Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-17 and 19-21 were rejected. Based upon the remarks which follow, Applicants respectfully request that such rejections be withdrawn.

I. Examiner Interview Summary

On May 23, 2006, telephonic interview was held between Examiners Hirshfeld and Nguyen and Applicant's attorney, Todd A. Rathe. The rejection of the claims based upon Sato U.S. Patent No. 2002/0159805 was discussed. In particular, Applicants requested allowance of the claims by pointing out that Sato fails to disclose a redirector movable between a first position in which the media sheet moving in the second direction moves along one of the second path and the third path and a second position in which the media sheet moving in the second direction moves along the other of the second path and the third path such as recited in claim 1. Applicant further noted that nowhere does Sato disclose positioning a sheet of media with its trailing edge upwardly beyond the tip of flapper 56 and subsequently reversing the direction of roller 52 to move the sheet of media to two-side path 152. In contrast, Sato discloses that the only place such a sheet may go is to sheet discharging portion 43. Nowhere does Sato disclose how flappers 56 and 58 should be positioned or that flappers 56 and 55 are operably positioned to somehow direct the sheet of media to path 152 as an alternative to portion 43.

Examiners Hirshfeld and Nguyen indicated that such arguments would be taken into further consideration. Examiners Hirshfeld and Nguyen further agreed to call Applicants' attorney should further concerns be identified.

Applicants wish to thank Examiners Hirshfeld and Nguyen for the opportunity to discuss the rejections.

II. Rejection to Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 12, 15, 17 and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Based Upon Sato and Hashimoto.

Atty. Dkt. No. 200209155-1

Page 2 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 12, 15, 17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato, U.S. Patent No. 2002/0159805, in view of Hashimoto et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,445,903. For the reasons which follow, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of such claims be withdrawn.

Claim 1 recites a printer including a flipper configured to engage and drive a sheet of media in a first direction and in a second opposite direction towards one of a second path and a third path. Claim 1 further recites a redirector movable between a first position in which the media sheet moving in the second direction moves along one of the second path and the third path and a second position in which the media sheet moving in the second direction moves along the other of the second path and the third path.

Claim 8 recites a method in which a directional movement of print media is reversed and in which the media being reversed is selectively directed to one of a second media and a third media path.

Claim 15 recites a printer having media flipping means for engaging a print media and reversing a direction of movement of the media along a first printing path and redirection means for selectively directing the reversed print media into a second path or a third path.

Claim 21 recites an apparatus, a media driver configured to engage and move printhead media along a first path in a first direction to an output tray and further configured to move printhead medium along the first path in a second opposite direction towards one of a second path and a third path. The apparatus further includes a director movable between a first position in which media being driven by the media driver in the second direction is directed into the second path and a second position in which the media being driven by the media driver in the second direction is directed into the third path.

Atty. Dkt. No. 200209155-1

Neither Sato nor Hashimoto, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a printer or an apparatus which includes a media flipper or driver configured to engage and move media in a first direction and to alternatively move the media in a second opposite direction towards one of a second path and a third path. Neither Sato nor Hashimoto, alone or in combination, discloses a redirector (Claim 1), redirection means (Claim 15) or a director (Claim 21) which selectively directs media being moved in the reverse or second direction into either a second path or a third path. In contrast, Sato merely discloses roller 52, when reversed, which merely moves a sheet in a reverse direction along a single path to a single output tray 43. Sato also discloses rollers 54 and 57, when reversed, move a sheet of media in a reverse direction along a single path 152 for two-sided printing. Nowhere does Sato disclose or even suggest that a sheet of media being moved in a reverse direction by roller 52 may alternatively be directed to or along another path to another output besides tray 43. Nowhere does Sato disclose or even suggest that a sheet of media being moved in a reverse direction by rollers 54 and 57 may be moved along a path to another output other than path 152 for two-sided printing.

In rejecting the claims based upon Sato in view of Hashimoto, the Office Action asserts that Sato teaches

A media flipper 52 which engages and drives the printed media in a first direction along the path 46 to a discharge tray 42 via a redirector 56 after printing on the media and in a second opposite direction toward one of the second path 45 to the discharge tray 43 and the third path to duplex path 152 via the path 46 (Sato, Figs. 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 18 and the paragraph [082]).

However, nowhere does Sato disclose that roller 52, when rotated in a reverse direction, drives media in a reverse direction to anywhere but discharge tray 43. Nowhere does Sato disclose that flipper 56 may be moved to a position such that media being moved in a reverse direction by roller 52 may be moved to duplex path 152. In contrast, each of flappers 55, 56 and 58 either allow media to pass in the first forward direction or permit media to pass in a second reverse direction to a single path. Flappers 55, 56 and 58 do not selectively direct media moving in a

Atty. Dkt. No. 200209155-1

reverse direction to one of two potential paths as recited in each of Claims 1, 8 and 21.

In support of its position, the Office Action refers to Figures 3, 4, 8, 11, 12 and 18 and paragraph 82. However, Figures 3, 4, 8, 11, 12 and 18 do not show roller 52 rotating in a reverse direction, wherein a flapper is selectively positioned to direct the media moving in a reverse direction to one of two potential paths or destinations. Likewise, paragraph 82 of Sato says nothing about selectively directing media being moved in a reverse direction to one of two potential paths or destinations. Hashimoto fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Sato. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1, 8, 15 and 21 is improper and should be withdrawn. Claims 3, 10 and 12 and Claim 17 depend from Claims 1 and 15, respectively, and are patentably distinct over Sato in view of Hashimoto for the same reasons.

III. Rejection of Claims 2, 6, 9, 13, 16 and 19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Based Upon Sato, Hashimoto and Muraoka.

Page 3 of the Office Action rejected Claims 2, 6, 9, 13, 16 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sato, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0159805, in view of Hashimoto et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,445,903, and further in view of Muraoka et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,353,727. Claims 2 and 6, Claims 9 and 13 and Claims 16 and 19 depend from Claims 1, 8 and 15, respectively, and overcome the rejection based upon Sato, Hashimoto and Muraoka et al. for the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1, 8 and 15. In particular, Muraoka fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Sato and Hashimoto. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 2, 6, 9, 13, 16 and 19 based upon Sato, Hashimoto and Muraoka should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 7, 14 and 20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Based Upon Sato, Hashimoto and Katsuyama.

Page 3 of the Office Action rejected Claims 7, 14 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sato, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0159805,

Atty. Dkt. No. 200209155-1

in view of Hashimoto et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,445,903, and further in view of Katsuyama et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,690,901. Claims 7 and 14 and Claim 20 depend from Claims 1 and 15, respectively, and overcome the rejection for the same reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of Claims 1 and 15, respectively.

V. Conclusion.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-17 and 19-21 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Atty. Dkt. No. 200209155-1

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 23, 2006

By Todd A. Rathe

RATHE PATENT & IP LAW

Customer Number: 22879

Telephone: (262) 478-9353

Faxsimile: (262) 238-1469

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276